

Indigenous Archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology

Peter J. Ucko

Institute of Archaeology, UCL.

Last academic year (2000-2001) saw the culmination of one of my long held intentions to introduce to a wide audience a subject which I term "Indigenous Archaeology". This article has two intentions: to explain why I think indigenous issues are of vital importance and concern to all archaeologists, and to provide a practical and social history of organising and running some associated events (the sort of information that usually remains unrecorded, but for another exception to this rule see Ucko 1987).

Since returning to the UK from Australia in 1981 (where I had been Principal of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies), and perhaps particularly through my experiences gained whilst organising the first World Archaeological Congress in Southampton and London in 1986, I had become increasingly concerned at the apparent lack of awareness, in archaeological colleagues and students alike, of the socio-political contexts of the practice and nature of archaeology in all parts of the world. My attempts to remedy this situation lay behind my executive editing of more than thirty-five volumes of the One World Archaeology series.

I have no real doubt that the socio-political dimensions of the nature and practice of archaeology have by now been accepted as an inherent feature within all archaeological activities, by almost everyone, at least in the UK, Australia, Canada and the USA. However, this does not imply that the archaeological discipline has confronted the 'ethics' of its practices, to the same extent as the anthropological discipline (e.g. Nugent 2001).

By the time I moved in 1996 to the Institute of Archaeology, UCL, I had also become concerned that, despite acceptance of the socio-political nature of archaeology, the very special relationships and problems which exist between archaeology and 'indigenous' peoples were either being ignored, or had never been appreciated¹. Over the last few years, therefore, the Institute has adopted Mission Statements which include the intention "to be internationally pre-eminent in the study, and comparative analysis, of world archaeology" but also "to ensure that the social, political and economic contexts of the practice of archaeology are taught and appreciated". It has also introduced a second year obligatory undergraduate course on "Public Archaeology", a "Public Archaeology" MA, and an MA option on "Archaeology and Ethnicity". This left a third year undergraduate gap which Dr. Bill Sillar and I tried to remedy in 1999/2000 with a half unit (20 contact hours) third year option on "Indigenous Archaeology". This latter course focused on 'indigenous peoples' and their relationships to anthropological and archaeological investigations. One of the main questions it addressed was the nature and definition of the term 'indigenism'/'indigenous' and its relationship, if any, to the evidence of the past as revealed by archaeology and/or oral history. The course examined the development

of archaeology and anthropology in relation to several factors such as: nationalism and colonialism, the construction of 'Otherness', ethnicity and identity, politics and minority rights, and ethical issues in archaeological and anthropological practice. The course used case studies from around the world to highlight how and why Indigenous Archaeology is often a contentious subject area due to land claims, the contested nature of ethnicity and the perceived need to establish 'pedigree' through the evidence of material culture objects.

The course was greeted positively by the 17 students who took it in 1999/2000. However, to incorporate as many indigenous lecturers as possible, the course had to be very flexible in order to be able to capitalise on the particular indigenous speakers who happened to be passing through London. This unsettled timetable made it hard for the students since they were unable to prepare for each specific topic.

We decided that to respond to these student concerns, funding should be secured to allow us to invite indigenous participants for particular topics on agreed dates. Both the Institute's weekly Research Seminars and, additionally, weekly evening Public Lectures, were to be organised by myself with Jo Dullaghan, Bill Sillar, and Natalie de Silva, Bill having taught the undergraduate half-unit course of the same name with me previously. We set out to raise some £16 000 to engage someone to work full-time for a few months to raise money for participants' travel and subsistence, and then to actually administer the ensuing research seminars, evening lectures and undergraduate teaching. In the event we secured only half of the sum needed (from the Friends of University College London). Logically we should then have aborted the whole venture, but decided instead to continue, with the four of us offering to carry out the extra work required ourselves, and to make use of spare bedrooms, and the offers of cheap or free accommodation from some of our colleagues. The £8 000 would then be used for travel and subsistence for indigenous and other invited participants.

By now we had reached a consensus on the topics which would be considered essential for discussions in the Research Seminars (the overall theme to be entitled "Indigenous Peoples and 'Patenting' the Past"), and from these Research Seminar topics it was relatively easy to modify the previous undergraduate syllabus to ensure the maximum participation of those indigenous speakers who would be coming to the Institute. The evening lectures (under the overall rubric of "Moving Forwards with Indigenous Peoples to the 21st Century") were designed to allow the indigenous speaker participating in a particular Research Seminar to engage with whatever topic s/he might choose, with an appropriate Chair to guide the proceedings. These lectures were expected to have audiences consisting of undergraduates, staff and members of the public (to take place in the Institute's newly refurbished 150-seat lecture theatre).

Then started the agonising business of pursuing those indigenous and non-indigenous academics and experts who might be potential speakers on specific topics. Not only had the topics to be made precise, and sometimes clarified, but also the unusual format being adopted for the Research Seminars had to be emphasised;

namely that there would be *several* ‘Speakers’, as well as several named ‘Discussants’, for each topic. After their contributions, at least one hour would be reserved for discussion. Bill Sillar and I would alternate as Chairs and would first enforce strict adherence to time limits, then taking responsibility for facilitating informed discussion. Prior to each Research Seminar, some selected bibliographic references (or even whole papers) would be circulated to potential participants.

I had several concerns in suggesting the topics to be considered in the above various contexts. First, that it was dangerously convenient for archaeologists (at least in the West) to assume that problems, tensions and confrontations between archaeology and indigenes were a problem for others, not for themselves, usually in the Third World, in Africa, or wherever, to be experienced only by those who chose to work in such situations. This was reflected in the apparent surprise of students and colleagues at the way that archaeological evidence is being ‘used’ today by warring factions in South-Eastern Europe or, closer to home, the adverse reaction from locals and ‘New Age’ devotees to English Heritage’s intervention in the “Seahenge Affair” (e.g. Champion 2000). There appeared to be little or no realisation that the fundamentals of the problems and principles of varied claims over the ownership and use of archaeological materials and places were equally relevant here in the UK. The seminar series was intended to demonstrate the diversity of issues confronting indigenous peoples and their relationship with archaeology, as well as the prospect for distinctive responses to these issues around the world, and I hoped that the relevance of these concerns would not be lost on a largely British audience.

Second, having discovered that the disciplines of Social Anthropology and Legal Studies had moved into areas concerned with the nature of property and all kinds of rights of ownership (e.g. Strathern 1996), including intellectual rights (e.g. see several chapters in Benthall 1999; Brush 1996), it seemed at the very least to be highly desirable that archaeologists should be made aware of the questions and problems being discussed. Not only did they need to see the relevance of these discussions to their own archaeological practices, but they should surely also be contributing to several of them, not least those concerned with heritage and identity (e.g. Coombe 1993 for an example of such legal discussions).

Third, largely divorced from such anthropological and legal debates, there had developed an octopus-like growth of NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisations) and other organisations, both national and international, which were heavily involved with human rights in general, but also with indigenous rights in particular. Many archaeologists were, and are, simply unaware of these developments and, as a consequence, they were ignorant of the relevance of these organisations to questions about the ‘ownership’ of the earth (and all that lies within it), or to the manipulation of images from the past, (whether from rock art, statuary, or bark or sand paintings, e.g. see Golvan 1989). These organisations are generating international norms that seek to define who is indigenous and what rights of control indigenous people should have over their cultural practices and material heritage. Through this process, a new generation of indigenous peoples has grown up who remain committed to their individual indigenous identities, but are also knowledgeable and competent in the areas of international diplomacy and legislation. I doubt whether more than a handful of my

colleagues and students were, or are, aware that UNESCO is on the point of establishing a “World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts”, with the brief to advise the World Heritage Committee on the Cultural Landscape category of listings, or that it is intended to create a new “special UN rapporteur for indigenous issues”, together with an indigenous forum to advise the UN on Human Rights. Thus another aim of the seminar series was to highlight the role of these NGOs and the indigenous peoples who work within them and to create a forum where academics, NGOs and indigenous people could listen to and discuss their diverse positions and experiences.

If archaeologists were aware at all about the relationship of their work to indigenous concerns, it was usually only about the ‘reburial issue’ and, perhaps, other claims for repatriation, which had been brought to their notice through publications (e.g. Fforde and Ormond-Parker 2000) and well publicised specific examples in the press, such as the extraction of Aboriginal leader Yagan’s head from under still-born babies in Liverpool’s Everton Cemetery (see Fforde 2002).

Given this situation of ignorance(s) (or at the very least, disregard) within archaeology, there was no contestation simply because there was no, or little, appreciation that there were any areas to be contested! All this, I believed (and still believe) was likely to lead to an inevitable number of problems regarding rival claims of ownership of ‘the heritage’. On the one hand were those directly involved in these issues (both indigenous and academic, not necessarily agreeing with each other) and on the other, the non-expert audience we hoped to attract. Beyond Britain, for example in the real world of Australia, sophisticated discussions between anthropologists, linguists, lawyers and historians were taking place, (e.g. in a two day workshop in Western Australia entitled, “Crossing Boundaries... in Native Title” (Toussaint 2001).

To confront this situation of overall ignorance, it was clear that a huge number of complex matters would have to be covered in each Research Seminar (in the event, usually accomplished reasonably successfully by the Speaker/Discussant format) but this would inevitably entail a degree of superficiality. At the Research Seminars, therefore, the Chair usually started proceedings by emphasising that each of the weekly topics really deserved at least a term’s discussion in itself, and that each ideally should be the topic of a book, but our most immediate intention was to demonstrate the importance of these issues, and the diversity and strength of opinion held by those involved.

Despite such inevitable shortcomings, the format seemed to work well: week after week the seminar room (holding between 50 and 80 people) was packed, with ‘regular’ attendees as well as a shifting participation suited to the particular topic under discussion that sometimes required a video link to a subsidiary room. The evening Public Lectures could count on a steady audience of 40 people, consisting often of the undergraduates who were enrolled for the third year option, and their friends, some members of the Institute staff, and some members of the public (the whole evening series having been advertised to Alumni and through *Survival International*, the *Britarch* mailing list and the Institute’s own web-site, as well as to selected museums, and archaeological and related organisations in the Greater London

area). For certain topics the audiences reached 120.

In both fora it was perhaps the unusual combination, and heterogeneous nature of the variety of experts from the UK and many other parts of the First, Third and Fourth Worlds, all gathered together to discuss a particular advertised topic, each with their own perceptions, experiences and assumptions, that continued to draw and maintain such wide interest (see Appendix).

The topic for the first two weeks of seminar discussions and lectures was the nature and meaning of the term 'indigenous' itself - what it had been derived from, how its meaning could vary and be used according to context, (whether anthropological, political, legal or NGO) and how such variations could sometimes be useful and at other times could cause confusion. It appeared to be new to most of the archaeologists in the seminars and lectures that any alternative definition or usage of the term 'indigenous' existed beyond the criterion of 'primary'. Even within such definitions of 'primacy' there were challenges to archaeological interpretations of which they had been only vaguely aware. Discussion forced them to confront the kinds of questions being asked of archaeological interpretation in the contexts of legal battles over land claims that sometimes required archaeologists to demonstrate longevity of occupation and continuity of cultural practices.

After two weeks it had become clear that decisions about which group was indigenous and which was not, were at least as much a matter of politics as anything else. Thus, for example, in some cases, the 'indigenes' in the real world were indisputably archaeological 'latecomers' - for example, the Masai claim to be the indigenous representatives of Africa (and see e.g. IPACC, Annual Report 1998/99, Appendix B; Crawhall 1999), or the refusal by authorities in India or South America to accept the notion of 'indigenes' at all. In the light of these discussions, the World Archaeological Congress, the only archaeological organisation which has taken notice of such matters as indigeneity, must surely now update, and possibly rethink, its current procedure regarding recruitment to its eight reserved Executive places for indigenous members.

It was already clear from these first discussions that, as Neal Ascherson reported in his first editorial of *Public Archaeology* for 2001, the debates had worked "largely because of the massive common sense of the participating indigenes", in the first two weeks. This referred to the participation of Australian Aborigine Michael Williams, Director of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Studies Unit in Brisbane, and Bolivian Juan de Dios Yapita who "...politely decline(d) the controversial implications and definitions sometimes offered... by European colleagues". As far as Michael was concerned, he, of course, could speak with some confidence coming from an indigenous background whose primacy of occupation could not be questioned.

In the context of the apparent 'simplicity' of primacy situations in Australia and north America, and the apparent 'complexity' of "'Indigenism' in Practice" (the title given to the second Research Seminar), both in principle and in practice, the series continued in the third week by examining the specific topic of museums' representations of ethnicity and indigeneity aimed at the public. Museum curators and aca-

demographic museologists raised issues about control of information, about who it is who determines what messages are to be conveyed about the nature of 'Others' to museum visitors. It soon became clear that many of the questions often asked about the nature of cultures as static or dynamic remained central to what might be found in museum displays. The dynamism, and changing nature of ethnicities were all too rarely confronted in the museum context. Such problems, it was felt, were often compounded by ongoing judgmental biases tied to the nature of remains available to be displayed, whether monumental, 'art' or otherwise. In these discussions the unusual dimension of debate was provided by the interplay between Lorna Abungu, Executive Officer of the Kenya-based International Council of African Museums, and Nasario Ku, the on-site Museum Curator at Lamanai in Belize.

In the fourth week came the problem of formulating rights for indigenous groups in areas of environmental contestation, such as forestry, resource use, land rights and bio-diversity. Academic experts examined the problems associated with ownership of many 'wild plants' and domesticated crops, and the right to control modifications of those 'materials' in the future. Seminar participants were made aware, on the one hand, of the complex legal issues involved in trying to formulate principles of communal ownership of 'knowledge', and on the other of the diversity of local practices which any legal framework would have to cover. Discussions about the issues involved in facilitating conventions or proposed international legislation were brought sharply into focus through the contrasting views of anthropologist Philip Burnham on the one hand, and Moki Monono of the Traditional Council from Limbe in the tropical forest of Cameroon. The indigenous expert contrasted the nature of ownership claims by his own people, and others living in (and by) the forest, as against the claims of rights by loggers and governments, and described how some loggers had been forcibly removed by the indigenous forest dwellers. The ongoing nature of the debate is indicated by the recent arrival (July 2001) of a 20-page email from Moki, commenting in detail on Philip's initial paper (Burnham 2001) which had been pre-circulated to seminar participants!

The question of ownership rights continued to be the focus of attention when the topic of the seminars and lectures moved on to consider the principles, and decision making, involved in the practice of 'conservation' – and whether it should be considered destruction or preservation. As Edward Halealoha Ayau from Hawai'i stressed, *indigenous* 'conservation' processes (such as those employed to protect funerary goods by burial, or reburial) could equate to *Western* notions of 'destruction'. In many ways, also, there was a real danger that the conservation of archaeological sites and landscapes could be used to justify the removal of control from the local populations who originally constructed them and previously maintained them. All too often Western assumptions about 'conservation' being self evidently positive practice could, and should, be questioned. The seminar learned from whence Western concepts regarding conservation had derived (whether by recording on paper or through actual physical interventions), and it was presented with a case study from Hawaii where Glenn Wharton, a practising Western conservator, was attempting to involve the community in decisions as to how – and to what stage of its previous, varied, history – a statue should be 'restored'. In Sri Lanka, as speaker Jagath Weerasinghe informed the audience, ideas and *desiderata* of Western conservation ideals (now

also held by professional Sri Lankan conservators) could be in conflict not only with secular views of the public at large, but also with religious orthodoxy (and see Wijesuriya 2000).

Heritage managers should be aware of the profound effect that some of their projects, ideologies and assumptions may have in an 'indigenous' group where identity and livelihood may depend on landscapes that frequently become fossilised archaeological sites due to conservation processes, or on objects which are symbolically significant and whose status could change with insensitive handling.

The seminars in weeks six and seven examined how indigenous rights, as previously discussed in the contexts of legislation and conservation were protected, and/or abused through 'performance', through the media, and by tourism (and see Strathern 2001 for the way items classed in the West as either art or as technology may decide what form of patenting, as opposed to copyrighting legislation may become appropriate). Again, the matters presented by speakers revealed astonishing complexities, from Kaori Tahara, an Ainu from Sapporo in Japan, who discussed the nature of claims to be an Ainu within the context of living as part of the dominant Japanese society, to Alan Ereira who had filmed the Kogi of Colombia and had tried to carry out the intentions lying behind their request to be filmed. As these discussions brought home forcibly, we all 'consume' images of indigenous people and their actions, belongings and attitudes, through magazines, TV, the music and tourist industries, but all this raises questions about who creates and controls these images, and who benefits from them. As we learnt from Gustavo Politis from Argentina, the very future, let alone nature, for those such as the hunting and gathering Nukaks of the Colombian tropical forests, depends on the nature and effects of 'globalisation'.

The subsequent two sessions focused on considerations of what constitutes the human body in different cultures and in particular social contexts, and how far and in what ways, physical manifestations necessarily represent identity. The seminar was informed by anthropologist Jane Hubert regarding incarceration into British mental institutions which de-humanised and de-gendered living human individuals and eventually brought about their social death (and see Hubert 2000). In this regard also the nature and aims of mass killing, 'ethnic cleansing' and other appropriations of the 'person' were discussed by experts on Nazi atrocities (and see Hinton 1998), and by those involved with forensic archaeology in South-eastern Europe. All these shocking events were placed not only into their economic-political contexts but also within the social needs of bereavement and mourning. Such recognition of the essentially personal nature of death and grieving was also examined from the point of view of the thousands of 'scientific specimens' of indigenous peoples held in museums, whether in their countries of origin or overseas. The opinions of a Native American archaeologist, Joe Watkins, and of an Australian Aborigine, Lyndon Ormond-Parker, an activist in the fight to repatriate human remains, were heard with growing appreciation of what the deceased remains of one of their own people might represent to indigenous groups in many parts of the world (and see especially Watkins 2000). Alinah Segobye from Botswana reported on the extraordinary events surrounding the recent return of "El Negro" from Spain to Botswana (and see Parsons and Segobye 2002), and thus made it clear that ownership of the human body

could have significant implications far beyond the individual or group concerned, sometimes moving into the international and national arenas of Land Rights and nationalistic and regional identities.

The final seminar and Public Lecture confronted the question of indigenous rights in the face of the construction of massive dams, and of mining particularly in countries such as Botswana, India, Pakistan, Turkey and Zimbabwe, with speakers and discussants participating from each of those countries. Here, many of the themes of 'dominance', 'Otherness', cultural deprivations and Land Rights resurfaced. Polarised against those such as the representatives of Kurdish Human Rights movements, who saw only negative aspects to such developments, were the undoubted economic and health benefits of water, electricity and other commodities which could be brought to whole regions of undeveloped areas of the world. Several speakers emphasised that, although such projects could bring wide ranging social benefits, the political and economic reality often made it much easier to finance and impose massive dams and mines than to educate local people and negotiate a wide range of small scale intermediate technology solutions that may have greater long-term benefits. Not surprisingly, considerable discussion took place about the role of archaeologists in carrying out environmental/cultural impact statements, and whether or not such enquiries played into the hands of the dominant, exploitative society. It was suggested that archaeologists should be as conscious of the ethical implications of this type of work as they have become concerning the dangers of commenting on the authenticity of looted artefacts.

It is unlikely that those who participated in any of the sessions described above remained untouched by what they had witnessed. It is, of course, difficult to assess the success or otherwise, of such events. However, participation in them remained high and largely participatory. There was no occasion when discussion dried up. Student comment was overwhelmingly positive (and the third year undergraduate course for 2001/2002 will in future be a *full* unit, raising "awareness regarding the critical points and issues in the formation, recognition and consequences of recognising those who are indigenous", including those of the UK and Western Europe), and there were unending demands to know whether the events of the previous ten weeks would lead to publication, and/or to further, more detailed seminars². To many, the occasions had also afforded their first chance to see and talk to indigenous people, be they Australian Aborigine, Native American, or Ainu.

It is my contention that all those involved in these discussions, and occasional confrontations, will have benefited from having witnessed and participated in them. Those who are archaeologists should have gained knowledge about the way that their profession may affect the lives of other human beings (sometimes no doubt for the 'good', and sometimes not). No longer should they be indiscriminate in their use of terms such as 'primitive', 'tribal', or whatever; they should all have learnt about the changing nature of cultures, of ethnicities and, thereby, of vested interests. They cannot have failed to see that 'heritage', 'conservation', 'tourism' are all themselves loaded with meanings, and that they bring consequences to the societies involved which may be far removed from that initially assumed by the archaeologist. Archaeology is a social practice, undertaken within particular socio-political contexts. As

such it behoves archaeologists to understand how knowledge of the past, and of the present of “Others”, not only plays a part in the social, political and economic relations of people in the present, but will undoubtedly also do so in the future. Rights to control ones own heritage, ones own environment and ones own practices should be essential to Human Rights in general. Those who participated in the series of events at the Institute last year cannot have failed to come away without at least a better understanding of the complexities of certain events and situations, but also of the profound importance for archaeologists to be aware of the issues in order to avoid causing unwanted human disaster.

On a pessimistic final note, there were unexpected absences from all of the events, including both senior and junior staff members of the Institute of Archaeology. Hopefully, this did not reflect a return to the 1970s and 1980s when so many claimed that the ‘objective’, ‘scientific’ nature of archaeology placed it outside and above the lowly concerns of human politics and social manoeuvring. Archaeology should only flourish if it recognises and accepts its ongoing role within the wider community.

Acknowledgements

If space allowed I would have liked to thank all speakers and audiences participating in the events which I have summarised above (Please refer to Appendix). However, I must name Louise Martin, Olivia Forge and Jane Hubert for their assistance in providing accommodation for visiting Speakers and Discussants. I take much pleasure in acknowledging Tim Johnson’s assistance and interest in this venture.

Without Jo Dullaghan, Bill Sillar and Natalie de Silva nothing of the above would have happened.

Finally, I thank Jo Dullaghan, Jane Hubert and Cornelia Kleinitz for having commented on a draft of this paper and particularly Bill Sillar for his fine rewriting of it! (And Natalie for deciphering my terrible handwriting!!!)

References

- Ascherson, N. 2001. Editorial. *Public Archaeology* 1, 225-6.
- Benthall, J. 1999. The Critique of Intellectual Property. *Anthropology Today* 15.
- Benthall, J. 2001. Indigenism and Intellectual Property Rights. *Anthropology News* April 5.
- Brush, S. B. and Strabinsky D.(eds) 1996. *Valuing Local Knowledge: Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights*. Washington: Island Press.
- Burnham, P. 2001. Whose Forest? Whose Myth? Conceptualisations of Community Forests in Cameroon, in Abramson A. and Theodossopoulos D. (eds), *Mythical Lands, Legal Boundaries*. London: Pluto Press, 31-58.
- Champion, M. 2000. *Seahenge. A Contemporary Chronicle*. Aylsham: Barnwell’s Timescape.
- Coombe, R. J. 1993. The Properties of Culture and the Politics of Possessing Identity: Native Claims in the Cultural Appropriation Controversy. *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence* 6, 249-85.
- Crawhall, N. 1999. *Indigenous Peoples of South Africa: Current Trends*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Fforde, C. 2002. ‘Yagan’ and ‘Collecting, Repatriation and Identity’, in Fforde, C., Hubert, J. and Turnbull, P. (eds), *The Dead and their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Fforde, C. and Ormond-Parker L. 2001. Appropriation Developments in the UK. *Indigenous Law Bulletin* 5, 9-13.
- Golvan, C. 1989. Aboriginal Art and Copyright: the Case for Johnny Bullun Bullun. *European*

- Intellectual Property Review*, 10, 346-355.
- Hinton, A. 1998. Why Did the Nazis Kill? *Anthropology Today* 14, 9-15.
- Hubert, J. 2000. The Social, Individual and Moral Consequences of Physical Exclusion in Long-stay Institutions, in Hubert J. (ed.), *Madness, Disability and Social Exclusion. The Archaeology and Anthropology of 'Difference'*. London: Routledge, 196-207.
- Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee (IPACC). 1998-99. *Annual Report*. Cape Town, South Africa: IPACC.
- Nicholas, G. P. 2001. The Past and Future of Indigenous Archaeology: Global Challenges, North American Perspectives, Australian Prospects. *Australian Archaeology* 52, 29-40.
- Nugent, S. 2001. Anthropology and Public Culture. *Anthropology Today* 17, 10-14.
- Parsons, N. and Segobye A. 2002. Missing Persons and Stolen Bodies: the Repatriation of 'El Negro' to Botswana, in Fforde, C., Hubert, J. and Turnbull, P. (eds), *The Dead and their Possessions: Repatriation in Principle, Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Price, C. In Preparation *Conservation: Destruction or Preservation*.
- Sillar, B. and Fforde, C. (eds.) forthcoming. Indigenous Peoples and 'Patenting' the Past. *Public Archaeology Special Edition*.
- Strathern, M. 1996. Potential Property, Intellectual Rights and Property in Persons. *Social Anthropology* 4, 15-32.
- Strathern, M. 2001. The Patent and the Malanggan. *Theory, Culture and Society* 18, 1-38.
- Toussaint, S. (ed.). 2001. *Crossing Boundaries: Cultural, Legal and Historical Issues in Native Title*. Perth: University of Western Australia Press.
- Ucko, P. J. 1987. *Academic Freedom and Apartheid. The Story of the World Archaeological Congress*. London: Duckworth.
- Watkins, J. 2000. *Indigenous Archaeology. American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Wijesuriya, G. 2000. Conserving the Temple of the Tooth Relic, Sri Lanka. *Public Archaeology* 1, 99-108.

Appendix

List of participants at the Institute of Archaeology Research Seminars and Public Lectures, January-March 2001.

- Lorna Abungu**, International Council of African Museums, Nairobi, Kenya
Dr Bill Adams, formerly Department of Archaeology, University of Kentucky, USA
Dr Denise Arnold, Department of Spanish & Spanish-American Studies, Kings College, London, UK
Edward Halealoha Ayau, Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei (Group Caring for the Ancestors of Hawai'i), Honolulu, Hawai'i
Anne Barron, London School of Economics, London, UK
Dr Tim Bayliss-Smith, Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, UK
Jonathan Benthall, formerly Royal Anthropological Institute, London, UK
Dr Robin Boast, Cambridge University Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology, UK
Dr Stephen Brush, Human and Community Development, University of California, Davis, USA
Dr Richard Bourne, Commonwealth Policy Studies Unit, University of London, UK
Professor Phil Burnham, Department of Anthropology, UCL, UK
Dr Phyllida Cheyne, Acadia Environmental Legal Consultancy, London, UK
Dr Phillipe Dallais, Swiss Ethnological Institute, Berne, Switzerland
Professor James Dempsey, School of Native Studies, University of Alberta, Canada
Dr Juan de Dios Yapita, Instituto de Lengua e Cultura Aymara, La Paz, Bolivia
Jo Dullaghan, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Sally Eberhardt, Kurdish Human Rights Project, London, UK
Maria Luz Endere, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Alan Ereira, Sunstone Films Producer, London, UK
Dr Dorian Fuller, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Chris Gosden, Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford, UK
Emeritus Professor David Harris, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Professor Olivia Harris, Department of Anthropology, Goldsmiths College, UK
Professor Fekri Hassan, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK

Isabel Hilton, Journalist and Writer, London, UK
Jane Hubert, Department of Psychiatry of Disability, St George's Hospital London, UK
Jane Kaye, Faculty of Law, University of Oxford, UK
Dr Nasim Khan, Department of Archaeology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan
Professor Michael Hunter, School of History, Birkbeck College, London, UK
Nasario Ku, Lamanai site museum, Belize
Professor Tony Kushner, Department of History, University of Southampton, UK
Professor Robert Layton, Department of Anthropology, University of Durham, UK
Dr Kevin MacDonald, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Grace Masego Nkelekang, University of Gaborone, Botswana
Dr Nick Merriman, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Koji Mizoguchi, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Rabindra Mohanty, Deccan College, Pune, India
Moki Monono, Traditional Council, Limbe, Cameroon
Ursula Muller, 4th World Association, Stockholm, Sweden
Dr Vivek Nanda, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Lyndon Ormond-Parker, formerly The Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action, Queensland, Australia
Dr Innocent Pikiaryi, University of Harare, Zimbabwe
Dr Gustavo Politis, Department of Archaeology, Universidad, Olavarria, Argentina
Dr David Pendergast, Curator Emeritus, Royal Ontario Museum, Canada
Dr Andrew Reid, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Mandy Rose, BBC Documentary Producer, London, UK
Professor Mike Rowlands, Department of Anthropology, UCL, UK
Tim Schadla-Hall, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Nigel Seeley, The National Trust, London, UK
Professor Alinah Segobye, Department of History, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana
Sam Serafy, Independent Film Researcher, Washington, USA
Professor Stephen Shennan, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Bill Sillar, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Natalie de Silva, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Robin Skeates, Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, UK
Rupert Soskin, School of Insight and Intuition, London, UK
Henry Stobart, Department of Music, Royal Holloway College, UK
Professor Marilyn Strathern, Department of Social Anthropology, University of Cambridge, UK
Dean Sully, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Kaori Tahara, Ainu Association of Sapporo, Japan
Professor Peter Ucko, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr Tao Wang, Department of Art and Archaeology, SOAS, UK
Dr Joe Watkins, Choctaw Association, Oklahoma, USA.
Jagath Weerasinghe, Postgraduate Institute of Archaeology, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka
Dr Marian Wenzel, Bosnia-Herzegovina Heritage Rescue, London, UK
Glenn Wharton, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Professor Michael Williams, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Unit, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
Mrs Patricia Wiltshire, Institute of Archaeology, UCL, UK
Dr James Woodburn, formerly Department of Anthropology, London School of Economics, UK
Professor Richard Wright, formerly Chief Archaeologist, International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

Endnotes

¹While I was writing this article I was sent a copy of Nicholas 2001, a work based on a lecture given by him at Flinders University, Adelaide a year earlier. Not only does Nicholas review most of the problems discussed here, thereby coincidentally stressing my insistence on the importance of the archaeology-indigenous peoples dialogue, but he also uses "the concept of indigenous archaeology" albeit "archaeology with, for and by Aboriginal peoples" (Nicholas 2001, 31).

² The proceedings have already been referred to in one publication (Benthall 2001), and will form the thematic focus of at least one future number of the journal *Public Archaeology* (Sillar and Fforde In